

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action of June 2, 2005, are earnestly solicited.

Claims 19 and 20 have been amended to correct for inadvertent errors. These amendments are not believed to narrow the scope of these claims. Claims 1—20 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 7—14 and 18—20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breed (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,787 B1) in view of Doyle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,188) and Suman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,025,537). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Assuming arguendo that the cited combination is even remotely suggested in any of the three references (which it is not), no combination of these references claim, teach or suggest

“an instrument housing having a coupling mechanism adapted for releasably coupling the instrument housing to a preselected location on a vehicle”

as called for in Applicant's independent Claim 1, or

“an instrument housing including a clamp that is configured to be coupled to a component or structure of an automotive vehicle”

as called for in Applicant's independent Claim 11.

The Examiner has not cited specifically to any portion of the Breed disclosure for the above limitation of Claim 1, and a review of the Breed reference reveals no such

teaching.

For independent Claim 11, for the "clamp," the Examiner cites Breed at line 44 of column 4 to line 28 of column 5 for teaching "an instrument housing including a clamp that is configured to be coupled to a component or a structure of an automobile."

A careful review of this cited passage reveals no mention or even suggestion whatsoever of such a claimed structure.

Suman et al. likewise fails to meet at least the above limitations of independent Claims 1 and 11.

The Examiner's conclusion with respect to Suman et al. is, frankly, puzzling.

"Therefore, it would have been obvious...to apply the techniques of Suman et al. to the modified system of Doyle and Breed in order to provide a system that can identify the location of a vehicle, and can be used to immobilize and disable the vehicle in response to an appropriate command delivered in a radio frequency paging signal."

It is respectfully submitted that Applicant's claims are simply not directed to such a system.

Independent Claims 1 and 11 and their respective dependent Claims 2, 7—10, 19 and 12—14, 18, 20 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 3—6 and 15—17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breed (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,787 B1) in view of Doyle et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,188) and Suman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,028,537) as applied to Claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Diaz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,822 B1). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Without acceding to the Examiner's remarks with respect to the cited combination of references, Claims 3—6 depend from Claim 1 and Claims 15—17 depend from Claim 11. Therefore, at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claims 1 and 11,

Claims 3—16 and 15—17 are believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claims 1 and 11.

Claims 19—20, as amended herein, and Claims 1—18, as originally or previously submitted, are believed to be in condition for allowance, early acknowledgment of which is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

August 30, 2005

By:

Gordon K. Harris, Jr.

Gordon K. Harris, Jr., Reg. No. 28,615
(248) 944-6524
Attorney for Applicant

Ralph E. Smith, Reg. No. 35,474
CIMS 483-02-19
DaimlerChrysler Intellectual Capital Company LLC
DaimlerChrysler Technology Center
800 Chrysler Drive East
Auburn Hills, MI 48326-2757
248-944-6519